

DEC 26 2007

REMARKS/ ARGUMENTS

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected the claims stating that "the phrase 'such as' renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention." *Office Action mailed 10/26/07, page 4, paragraph 2.*

Applicant has currently amended the present claims to delete the "such as" language and are relying on the disclosure in the specification to provide examples of the enumerated classes of aversive agents. The claims should now be allowable.

Provisional Double Patenting Rejection


Applicant traverses this rejection. The Examiner can issue a double patenting rejection only upon granted claims in a patent. Neither US '926 nor the present application have granted as a patent; therefore the Examiner should grant the present application.

CONCLUSION

Given the foregoing claim amendment and the fact that the '926 application has not been granted, Applicant respectfully requests that the present claims be granted.

Should the Examiner have any concerns regarding the application, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner contact Applicant's undersigned attorney

Respectfully submitted,



James G. Vouras
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 34,453
Telephone No.: (215) 592-3410

Rohm and Haas Company
100 Independence Mall West
Philadelphia, PA 19106-2399
December 26, 2007